



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,793	02/11/2002	Darrel Cherry	10016811-1	7232

7590 09/08/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

POKRZYWA, JOSEPH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/074,793	CHERRY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph R. Pokrzywa	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 7-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 7-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/13/06 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment was received on 6/13/06, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1, 3, 4, and 7-25** are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 13-17, and 20-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shen (U.S. Patent Number 6,801,935).

Regarding **claim 1**, Shen discloses a method comprising sending an authorization code (PIN and/or security code) to a client computer (server 14) from a monitoring device (printer 30) remotely located relative to the client computer (see Figs. 1 and 4, and column 4, lines 18-31, and column 6, lines 10-34), subsequently sending a print job with the authorization code from the client computer to the remote monitoring device (column 6, line 21-column 7, line 6), the remote monitoring device checking whether the authorization code is valid (column 6, line 21-column 7, line 31, see Fig. 8), enabling printing of the print job upon determining that the authorization code is valid (column 6, line 21-column 7, line 31, see Fig. 8), and disabling printing of the print job upon determining that the authorization code is invalid (column 6, line 21-column 7, line 31, see Fig. 8).

Regarding **claim 3**, Shen discloses the method discussed above in claim 1, and further teaches that the retrieving is performed by an agent operating on a computer (within server 14, see Fig. 4, column 6, lines 21-50).

Regarding **claim 7**, Shen discloses that one or more computer-readable media comprises computer-executable instructions that, when executed, perform the method as recited in claim 1 (see Fig. 8, column 5, line 51-column 6, line 34).

Regarding **claim 8**, Shen discloses that in a public computer service center where multiple computers can be connected to a communications link associated with the service center (column 4, lines 18-36, and column 6, lines 21-50), a method comprising creating a request to log on to the communications link (column 5, line 51-column 6, line 19), sending an authorization code from a host (printer 30) located on the communication link to a client computer (server 14) located on the communications link (see Figs. 1 and 4, and column 4, lines

18-31, and column 6, lines 10-34), subsequently sending a print job from the client computer to a printer with the authorization code embedded in a header of the print job (column 6, line 21-column 7, line 6), and checking whether the authorization code is valid, prior to enabling or disabling the print job from printing (column 6, line 21-column 7, line 31, see Fig. 8).

Regarding **claim 13**, Shen discloses the method discussed above in claim 8, and further teaches that an agent retrieves the authorization code from the host and assigns the authorization code to the print job (within server 14, see Fig. 4, column 6, lines 21-50).

Regarding **claim 14**, Shen discloses that one or more computer-readable media comprises computer-executable instructions that, when executed, perform the method as recited in claim 8 (see Fig. 8, column 5, line 51-column 6, line 34).

Regarding **claim 15**, Shen discloses a system (see Figs. 1 and 3) comprising a communications link (Internet 12, see Fig. 1), a monitoring device (printer 30) attached to the communications link (see Figs. 1 and 3, and column 4, lines 18-31, and column 6, lines 10-34), an agent (server 14), configured to provide an interface between a computer (computing equipment 1, see Fig. 1) and the communication link (Internet 12), wherein the agent (server 14) receives an authorization code from the monitoring device (see Figs. 1 and 4, and column 4, lines 18-31, and column 6, lines 10-34), and assigns the authorization code to a print job sent by the computer (column 6, line 21-column 7, line 31, see Fig. 8), wherein the monitoring device (printer 30) is configured to receive the print job and verify whether the authorization code is valid (column 6, line 21-column 7, line 31, see Fig. 8).

Regarding **claim 16**, Shen discloses the system discussed above in claim 15, and further teaches that the monitoring device verifies whether the authorization code is valid by comparing

the authorization code to a data base to find a matching entry (column 6, line 21-column 7, line 31).

Regarding **claim 17**, Shen discloses the system discussed above in claim 15, and further teaches that the monitoring device permits printing of the print job by a printer if the authorization code is valid (column 6, line 21-column 7, line 31, see Fig. 8).

Regarding **claim 20**, Shen discloses the system discussed above in claim 15, and further teaches that the communications link comprises Ethernet access (see Figs. 1 and 3, and column 4, lines 18-31, and column 6, lines 10-34).

Regarding **claim 21**, Shen discloses the system discussed above in claim 15, and further teaches that the communications link is a communications network (see Figs. 1 and 3, and column 4, lines 18-31, and column 6, lines 10-34).

Regarding **claim 22**, Shen discloses the system discussed above in claim 15, and further teaches that the communications link is a switch (see Figs. 1 and 3, and column 4, lines 18-31, and column 6, lines 10-34).

Regarding **claim 23**, Shen discloses the system discussed above in claim 15, and further teaches that the monitoring device is a server (see Fig. 4, and column 4, lines 18-31, and column 6, lines 10-34).

Regarding **claim 24**, Shen discloses the system discussed above in claim 15, and further teaches that the authorization code is embedded in a header of the print job (see Fig. 7, column 5, lines 5-35).

Regarding **claim 25**, Shen discloses the system discussed above in claim 15, and further teaches that the authorization code is part of an HTTP communication related to the print job (column 4, lines 14-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 4, 9-12, 18, and 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen (U.S. Patent Number 6,801,935) in view of Gecht *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 6,859,832, cited in the Office action dated 4/17/06).

Regarding **claims 4, 11, and 18**, Shen discloses the methods and system discussed above in claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, but fails to expressly disclose if the authorization code comprises an expiration interval parameter.

Gecht discloses a method comprising sending a print job with the authorization code to the remote monitoring device (see Figs. 4 and 9, column 11, lines 16-60), the remote monitoring device checking whether the authorization code is valid (column 10, line 60-column 11, line 50), enabling printing of the print job upon determining that the authorization code is valid (column 11, lines 2-24), and disabling printing of the print job upon determining that the authorization code is invalid (column 11, lines 2-24). Further, Gecht teaches that the authorization code comprises an expiration interval parameter (column 8, lines 35-65, and column 11, lines 42-50).

Shen & Gecht are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that allow transmitting a user authentication of print jobs over the Internet. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teachings of Gecht within the system of Shen. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that Shen's system would become more secure, as a time for storage would be present for the specific print job, as recognized by Gecht in column 8, lines 35-65. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Gecht with the system of Shen to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4, 11, and 18.

Regarding *claims 9 and 10*, Shen discloses the method discussed above in claim 8, but fails to expressly disclose if the public computer service center is a hotel or an airport-based printing center.

Gecht discloses that in a public computer service center (spooling server 50) where multiple computers can be connected to a communications link associated with the service center (see Fig. 1), a method comprising creating a request to log on to the communications link (column 3, lines 1-26), sending a print job to a printer with an authorization code embedded in a header of the print job (see Figs. 4 and 9, column 9, lines 12-48, and column 11, lines 16-60, whereby encrypting data in a triple-DES format inherently includes an encryption key in the header of the data), and checking whether the authorization code is valid, prior to enabling or disabling the print job from printing (column 10, line 60-column 11, line 50). Further, Gecht teaches that the public computer service center is a hotel (column 4, lines 18-36) and also that that the public computer service center is an airport-based printing center (column 4, lines 18-36).

Shen & Gecht are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that allow transmitting a user authentication of print jobs over the Internet. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teachings of Gecht within the system of Shen. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that Shen's system would become usable by numerous customers, at a variety of locations, as recognized by Gecht in column 4, lines 24-36. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Gecht with the system of Shen to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9 and 10.

Regarding *claims 12 and 19*, Shen discloses the method and system discussed above in claims 8 and 15, respectively, but fails to expressly disclose if the authorization code contains a quality of service parameter.

Gecht discloses that in a public computer service center (spooling server 50) where multiple computers can be connected to a communications link associated with the service center (see Fig. 1), a method comprising creating a request to log on to the communications link (column 3, lines 1-26), sending a print job to a printer with an authorization code embedded in a header of the print job (see Figs. 4 and 9, column 9, lines 12-48, and column 11, lines 16-60, whereby encrypting data in a triple-DES format inherently includes an encryption key in the header of the data), and checking whether the authorization code is valid, prior to enabling or disabling the print job from printing (column 10, line 60-column 11, line 50). Further, Gecht teaches that the authorization code contains a quality of service parameter (column 8, lines 35-65, and column 11, lines 42-50).

Shen & Gecht are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being systems that allow transmitting a user authentication of print jobs over the Internet. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teachings of Gecht within the system of Shen. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that Shen's system would become more use-friendly with the addition of Gecht's teachings, as the user would be able to select various print qualities for the job, as recognized by Gecht in column 8, lines 35-65. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Gecht with the system of Shen to obtain the invention as specified in claims 12 and 19.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Olsen *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 6,952,780) discloses a system that ensures secure transfer of a document from a client to a printer.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joe Pokrzywa whose telephone number is (571) 272-7410. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joseph R. Pokrzywa
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2625

jrj



JOSEPH R. POKRZYWA
PRIMARY EXAMINER